



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/043,384 ^,	10/26/2001	Antonius Hendricus Maria Holtslag	NL000547	4617
24737	7590 02/26/2004		EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			MENGISTU, AMARE	
	P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		2673	<i>a</i>
			DATÉ MAILED: 02/26/2004	, <i>9</i>

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
_	10/043,384	HOLTSLAG ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Amare Mengistu	2673	
The MAILING DATE of this communicate Period for Reply	ion appears on the cover sheet v	ith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA* - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica* - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) dated if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a ation. ys, a reply within the statutory minimum of the y period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC by statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) This action is FINAL. 3) Since this application is in condition for a closed in accordance with the practice unit 	☑ This action is non-final. allowance except for formal ma	• •	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the applied 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction.	rithdrawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Ex 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by	accepted or b) objected to to the drawing(s) be held in abeya correction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fa a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority doc 2. Certified copies of the priority doc 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International * See the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received. uments have been received in a ne priority documents have been Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☑ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-93) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8.	948) Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

Application/Control Number: 10/043,384

Art Unit: 2673

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1,6-12,14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wakabayashi et al (2003/0193449 A1) in view of Salters et al (2001/0040436).

As to claims 1,6-12,14,15, Wakabayashi et al (hereinafter Wakabayashi) discloses a sub-field driven display device (fig.1 (1a)) having a sub-field converter (fig. 1(8)) for converting video signals into sub-field data. Wakabayashi did not expressly detailed that the sub-field are weighted and duplicated for achieving a plurality of gray levels as a ternary distributed sub-field weights. However, the patent of Salters et al (hereinafter Salters) clearly teaches that the sub-field are weighted and duplicated for achieving a plurality of gray levels as a ternary distributed sub-field weights (see, page 5, [0031] and [0033] and alternate light output control patterns in predetermined units of the display (page 2 [0015]; check-board pattern).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated the distribution of sub-field weight by duplicating the gray levels as taught by **Salters** into the display system of **Wakabayashi** because this will allow the **Wakabayashi** display to reduce flicker and provide a high quality image display.

Application/Control Number: 10/043,384

Art Unit: 2673

The way

3. Claims 2-5, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wakabayashi et al in view of Salters et al as applied to claim*1,6-12,14-15 above, and further in view of Tajima et al (6,249,265 B1).

As to claims 2, **Wakabayashi** as modified by **Salters** discloses a ternary distribution of sub-field weights, but failed to teach the weight is symmetrically duplicated or the weights are increased at the center. The patent of **Tajima** teaches that the weight is symmetrically duplicated (see, figs. 36,39, and 40).

As to claims 3, 4, **Tajima** did not teaches that the weights are increased or highest sub-filed at the center of the distribution, but **Tajima** disclose increase or highest weight distribution of the sub-fields at the edges of sub-fields. It would obvious to one skill in the art to increase or highest weight distribution at the center.

As to claims 5, 13, **Tajima** did not expressly detailed the motion compensation means to enhance motion artifact reduction. However, **Tajima** duplicating sub-field method (see, figs. 36,39 and 40) will achieve a motion compensation to enhance the artifact the same way as the applicant.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments, see pages 8-10, filed Jan.30,2004, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-15 under USC 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of **Salters et al** (2001/004036).

Art Unit: 2673

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amare Mengistu whose telephone number is (703) 305-4880. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, T-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (703) 305-4938. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Primary Examiner

Page 4

Art Unit 2673

A.M

Feb.22,2004